

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 09/939,855 | 08/27/2001 | Sunil H. Contractor | BELL-0110/01065 | BELL-0110/01065 3230 | |
| 38952 | 7590 03/25/2005 | | EXAMINER | | |
| WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP | | | MILLER, BRANDON J | | |
| ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103 | | OR | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | , | | 2683 | | |
| | | | DATE MAIL ED: 03/25/2005 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| - AM | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 1000 | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
| Advisory Action | 09/939,855 | CONTRACTOR, SUNIL H. | | | | |
| , | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Brandon J Miller | 2683 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address | | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 04 March 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | | | | | |
| (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | | |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | |
| (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | |
| (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.NOTE: | | | | | | |
| 3.☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti | ion(s): | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | | | | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. | | | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | | | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | | | | | |
| \cdot | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding claims 1, 12, and 27 Silverman teaches determining a proximity of a called party to one or more subcriber locations (cell sites) (see col. 1, lines 59-62). These cell cites in Silverman are identified independent of called party predetermination because the cell cites are established before the called party enters them (see col. 3, lines 7-9). The "one or more subscriber locations" as claimed are not interpreted to mean one or more communication devices. Regarding claim 35 it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the received telephone call from a calling party line to a called party line adapt to include a called party wireline because telecommunication terminals are capable of originating calls towards various communication devices including wire line devices and it would allow for more efficient location-based call forwarding.

WILLIAM TROST SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600